REMARKS

Claims

Claims 1 to 80, 82 to 96, 98 to 109, 111 to 121, 123 to 130 and 132 to 135 remain in the application.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 4, 5, 7, 11, 24, 26, 30, 41, 42, 44, 48, 53, 65, 66, 73, 75, 79, 89, 91, 95, 102, 104, 108, 115, 129 and 139 have been amended to clarify their meaning. The Examiner's close review in this regard is appreciated.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1 to 3, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12 to 15, 17, 19 to 23, 25, 27 to 29, 31 to 34, 37 to 40, 43, 45 to 47, 49 to 52, 62 to 64, 67 to 69, 136 to 138 and 140 to 143 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Searfoss, III (US Patent 6,902,296). In addition, Claims 4, 5, 7, 11, 16, 24, 26, 30, 35, 41, 42, 44, 48, 53 to 61, 65, 66 and 139 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Searfoss, III.

Searfoss, III has been reviewed and it is noted that the priority claim of Searfoss, III is deficient in its teachings to give full support for the subject matter of the US Patent. In particular, the priority document fails to teach any light output quantities and, for example, the teaching at column 6, line 4 is not supported in any way in the priority document. The priority document is available from the USPTO PAIR system.

In view of this, the Searfoss, III reference has an effective dated of June 13, 2003. Applicants have already established a reduction to practice for all of the pending claims prior to June 13, 2003 by the affidavit filed with our response of October 20, 2005. As such the Searfoss, III reference is not relevant to the claims and any rejections based thereon should be withdrawn.

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Conclusions

In light of the foregoing, applicants submit that the claims are in a condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Roseann B. Caldwell, Reg. No. 37,077

BENNETT JONES LLP
4500 - 855 - 2nd Street S.W.
Calgary, Alberta CANADA
T2P 4K7

(403) 298-3661

Date: Sept 24/07